Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion, and general prices the author uses three-year averages, e. g., the crop yield for 1895 is the average for 1894–5–6, that for 1896 is the average for 1895–6–7, etc. After eliminating the linear secular trend in each of the three series of three-year averages he obtains "cycles" of yield, iron production, and prices. The differences between the original annual figures and the three-year averages for corresponding years are called "deviations." The deviations of yield and (1) of iron production and (2) of general prices are positively correlated to a moderate degree.

The vital question now at issue is this: are the crop yield cycles (as defined in the preceding paragraph) matched by similar cycles in iron production and general prices? If so, do the cycles come in concurrent years or is there a lag in iron production and prices? Computation of the coefficients of correlation gives the following table:

Cycles of yield per acre of	Lag of (1) and (2) behind crop yield.					
	Same year.	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 yrs.
9 crops correlated with cycles of						
(1) Pig-iron production...........	0.625	0.719	0.718	0.697	0.572	....
(2) General prices................	....	....	....	0.786	0.800	0.710

The conclusions drawn by Moore from the table of coefficients are that cycles in crops precede cycles in pig-iron production by two years and cycles in general prices by four years.

The differences between the coefficients are not large enough to warrant a conclusion as to the number years of lag for maximum correlation. Computation of the coefficients of correlation between first differences of the cycles would be, however, a test of greater significance. The radical drop of pig-iron production in a year of depression, as compared with the drop in prices on crops, and the averaging of non-homogenous years, *e.g.*, two years of great activity and one year of great depression (for instance 1906, 1907, 1908), makes a conclusion based on the size of the coefficients between three year averages of doubtful value. In correlating three-year averages instead of the annual figures Professor Moore is really measuring the cumulative effects of three years of good or bad crops on business conditions as represented by iron production and prices. The coefficients for the annual figures and for first differences would have been more interesting and significant.

Statisticians and economists are deeply indebted to Professor Moore for his fine work in developing the statistical complement of pure economics.

Colorado College. WARREN M. PERSONS.

Some Aspects of the Tariff Question. By Frank William Taussig, Ph. D., Litt. D. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1915. Pp. 365.

Professor Taussig begins his exposition with a brief but sufficient statement of the theory of international trade and tariff restrictions on such trade, covering some fifty pages. In the first chapter is discussed the effect of protective duties upon imports and domestic prices. In the second, attention is given to the argument for *Protection to Young Industries.* The third is devoted to a study of *The Principle of Comparative Advantage.* These chapters constitute Part I. In the rest of the book are considered in detail some of the principal lines of industry around which the tariff controversy has raged and which illustrate principles set forth in the introductory chapters: in Part II, Sugar; in III, Iron and Steel; in IV, Textiles.

In discussing the tariff on sugar, something is said of the effect of the remission of duty on sugar from Hawaii, provided for in the reciprocity treaty of 1876. It is pointed out that most of the supply still had to be got from less favored producers; that the price, therefore, did not fall because of the remission; that the United States Treasury lost and the Hawaiian planters gained by the arrangement. They were, in effect, included within the fold of the American protective system. The revolution in Hawaii, leading eventually to annexation, is attributed in large part to the desire of Hawaiian sugar interests for a permanent favored place in the American market, a desire stimulated by their temporary loss of protection under the McKinley tariff law.

The case of Hawaii illustrates the way in which external conditions may cause rearrangement of industry in accordance with the familiar principle of comparative advantage. The favored position of Hawaiian sugar in the American market made sugar production a comparatively advantageous industry, and tended towards exclusive devotion to this industry and to the importation of goods formerly produced in the islands.

The differential in favor of Cuban sugar, we should expect to redound wholly to the benefit of the Cuban producers, were it not that this sugar, together with that from other favored sources, constitutes such a large proportion of the total consumption in the United States. Under existing circumstances, however, it is thought that the actual burden on consumers has come to be, in recent years, somewhat less than the maximum duty, though remaining somewhat higher than the duties levied on the sugar from Cuba.

The study of the iron and steel industry, in Part III, gives opportunity for some interesting observations regarding the kinds of production in which Americans appear to have a comparative advantage. For example, it is pointed out in relation to the cutlery trade, that some kinds of cutlery are steadily imported, while other kinds are not imported at all. The latter are those made in great quantities of a single pattern; and it is where automatic machinery, interchangeable parts, standard patterns and mass production are possible, that Americans excel. On the other hand, cutlery of the non-standardized sorts is imported even over high duties.

Unlike many who have delved no more conscientiously into the detailed facts of industry, Professor Taussig does not believe that the *free trade versus protection* controversy can be settled by inductive argument. General reasoning from simple premises must first be appealed to and will remain of primary importance. In this, the conclusion of Mill and the classical economists, he is, in the reviewer's opinion, entirely right. But the inductive study which he presents, and for which his claims are thus sufficiently modest, is none the less of great value. It serves to illustrate concretely principles usually stated in the abstract. And for many minds it is calculated to give emphasis to those principles and to bring conviction of their truth.

HARRY GUNNISON BROWN.

University of Missouri.

A CORRECTION.

In my note on "Mechanical Devices in European Statistical Work," in the QUARTERLY PUBLICATIONS for June, I stated that certain tabulating machines referred to were of the "improved Hollerith type, printing automatically, both sub-totals and totals." The phrase "improved Hollerith type" was a free translation of "new Hollerith" in the German source. The rest of the description was an inference from the statement in the same source that the "old Hollerith" machines separately classified, "record by clock-dials and contain no provision for addition." I concluded from this (too hastily as it appears) that the new machines embodied the same improvements as those used in tabulating the thirteenth census of the United States (as indicated in footnote references). I wish to thank Mr. E. Davies of New York City, for the information that this inference was erroneous.

F. H. KNIGHT.

Cornell University.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE HEALTH OF GARMENT WORKERS.

The Eighth Report of the Henry Phipps Institute for the Study, Treatment and Prevention of Tuberculosis has just appeared. It is a monograph of one hundred and four pages on "Factors Affecting the Health of Garment Workers," written by H. R. M. Landis, M.D., and Janice S. Reed. It is the result of a study of nearly a thousand workers in the garment industry examined while at their work. In the study three distinct types are included, the modern standardized factory, the contracting factory, and the sweatshop. The study includes the condition of the factories, the racial characteristics of the workers together with their physical condition, and the effect of trade processes upon this condition. The home environment of the workers is included, and tuberculosis and fatigue are given particular attention. The study deserves the attention of anyone who is interested in the health conditions in this trade. In the Appendix, copies of the inquiry blanks are included. These have apparently been drawn up with great care and might well serve as a model for future investigations along similar lines.

W. B. B.